1	
2	CHICAGO INFRASTRUCTURE TRUST
3	BOARD MEETING
4	CITY OF CHICAGO
5	
6	BOARD MEMBERS:
7	MR. JAMES BELL, Chairman
	MS. DIANA FERGUSON
8	ALDERMAN JOHN POPE
	MR. DAVID HOFFMAN
9	MR. JORGE RAMIREZ
LO	
L1	
L2	
L3	
L4	
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
	August 28, 2012
L9	10:00 o'clock a.m.
20	Chicago Cultural Center
	75 East Washington
21	Garland Room, 5th Floor
	Chicago, Illinois
22	
23	
0.4	

1	CHAIRMAN BELL: Good morning and
2	welcome. I would like to call the meeting to
3	order. We have a pretty full agenda today and
4	we'd like to try to get through it and be
5	mindful of everyone's time and attendance today,
6	and thank you all for participating with us on
7	this Board and in this activity.
8	So I think I'll just get right into
9	the agenda. First we're going to have an
10	update on our articles of incorporation. It
11	will be brief. David, why don't you just let
12	them know what's happened subsequent to the last
13	meeting?
14	MR. NAREFSKY: It will be brief. The
15	articles have been filed. Congratulations. The
16	Trust is a not-for-profit under Illinois law.
17	CHAIRMAN BELL: Great. Thank you very
18	much for your help on that.
19	Update on our bylaws. Since the
20	last meeting, the only major revision we've had
21	with the bylaws is we have documented what
22	always was this Board's intent in terms of how
23	we would cooperate with the City's Inspector
24	General so that language is now part of our

1	bylaws, and so I'm going to open it up to the
2	rest of the Board to see if there are any other
3	comments because I think today we probably want
4	to put to vote whether or not we'd like to adopt
5	those bylaws as written knowing that with the
6	majority vote of this Board we can amend them as
7	necessary as we learn more as we start to
8	operate.

Any other comments on the bylaws?

MR. HOFFMAN: I'll make a comment.

Mr. Chairman, as you note, there's a new section

in the bylaws, 9.8, titled cooperation with IGO,

the Inspector General's Office.

I think this is a great addition, and I want to first commend you for the leadership in pushing forward to both have the language as it is and also to push it to be in the bylaws.

We could have our intent and our policy stated without anything written, we could have had a separate policy or we could have had the bylaws. To me this was the most secure way to do it, and I really appreciate your pushing for its inclusion in the bylaws, and I really

1	appreciate	your	pushing	for	this	language.
---	------------	------	---------	-----	------	-----------

I think it's clear that the intent of the language and what it says is that the programs and operations of the Trust are within the jurisdiction of the Inspector General's Office, and they have the ability to conduct investigations, audits or reviews of what we do, and we shall cooperate, which is exactly what I believe was important. I know everyone on the Board believes and I know especially you, Mr. Chairman, have been pushing for this. So I think this is very positive.

I'm very pleased with the language. I think the intent is clear and to me this puts the issue to rest.

I think that the rest of bylaws,

I've read them, and I think they're good. I

don't really have any comments or objections.

You and I have talked about this, the ability -
our ability as a Board to amend them, to add to

them as we see issues since we're so new makes

me comfortable in reading and thinking I don't

know if there's something missing but if there

is we can deal with it later.

1	So with that I have no further
2	comments and I would support our adoption of
3	them.
4	CHAIRMAN BELL: So we have a motion on
5	the table. Is there a second?
6	MS. FERGUSON: I'll second the motion.
7	CHAIRMAN BELL: I'll call for the vote.
8	All in favor?
9	(A chorus of ayes.)
10	All opposed?
11	(No response.)
12	That's it. Then we've adopted our
13	bylaws as currently written.
14	The next item on the agenda is the
15	election of the officers. At our last meeting I
16	proposed that John Pope be nominated and
17	considered for Vice Chair and Diana Ferguson for
18	secretary and treasurer.
19	Not having heard from any of the
20	other Board Members of any alternatives, I would
21	like to also call for a vote there unless
22	there's other comments.
23	MR. HOFFMAN: So moved.
24	MR. RAMIREZ: Second.

1	CHAIRMAN BELL: All in favor?
2	(A chorus of ayes.)
3	Good. Now I can share some of this
4	work.
5	MR. HOFFMAN: James, before we move on,
6	you and I had talked about the conflict of
7	interest policy, and I'm wondering whether
8	that and is that included I didn't want
9	I think I saw that it was listed as an
10	attachment to the bylaws, even though it's a
11	separate document.
12	As you know, my view is that I
13	saw there were some changes, but I don't think
14	they addressed all the things that need to be
15	changed, and I think it needs some more work and
16	I think we have time, so my recommendation would
17	be that we pass the bylaws but
18	CHAIRMAN BELL: Dave and I had a
19	discussion this morning. I don't think yet
20	we've worked out given what we talked about
21	last meeting, we've worked on all the concerns
22	around conflict of interest and we do want to
23	get our independent legal to take a look at that
24	and make sure that all the Board Members are

cover	red a	and w	ill	know	how	to	act	according	gly	to
make	sure	e tha	t we	don	't h	ave	a p	erception	or	any
real	conf	flict	s of	inte	eres	t.				

So we're going to hold that open.

We're going to hold the conflict of interest

document open. We've accepted the basic bylaws

but with the caveat that we're going to go work

on the conflict of interest document, have our

outside legal help us to make sure that we

capture all the concerns and we address the

issues appropriately for each of the Board

Members. That's duly noted in the minutes.

Open Meeting Act training. There is a requirement that each of the Board Members, and they just didn't single us out, this is all employees and directors of the City and people that are appointed by the City, have to take this one hour I think it's an online course by November 1.

So there's a document in your handout that will tell you where to go and do it. And I would advise all of us to try to get it done by November 1st, put an hour aside and just go through it because, as I understand, if

you walk away from it, it may seize up on you
and you'll have to start over so it's best to
get your training done all at once and get it
out of the way. So I would encourage everyone
to do that.

Okay. I think we can pass on the resolution allowing telephone participation in case of emergencies because that's included in our bylaws. There is a provision that Board Members can attend by telephone, and I think that will be adequate for those times and those needs when any of the Board Members need to do that so I think we can pass that.

Officers and directors insurance. I did get a note from Lois or was it you, Scott, I can't remember, but the insurance, we need to go out and procure it for our Board Members. I think we need to do that.

Obviously we can look at using the City's resources. They already have a broker that they use. The insurance seems to be reasonable. Something that we could deal with within our budget constraint. I think I have the numbers here somewhere. I just don't

1	remember what I exactly did with them. I think
2	the insurance brokers are USI Midwest and Arthur
3	J. Gallagher; is that correct?
4	MR. YONOVER: Yes.
5	CHAIRMAN BELL: So we can decide to go
6	there. What they're saying the estimated cost
7	for D and O coverage would be with limits of
8	5 million would be about \$25,000, so something
9	that we can handle within the budget.
10	But what I'd like to do is maybe
11	have allow our treasurer to go out and look
12	at this and see if we can maybe pursue this and
13	then look at some other options. Clearly we
14	need to get this done relatively soon in regards
15	to making sure we have adequate coverage to
16	protect us if we act in these capacities.
17	Any other thoughts or concerns?
18	(No response.)
19	Okay. Diana, I'll give you this
20	e-mail and you can decide to contact them or you
21	can look at some other options but we have to
22	get that done.
23	Okay. Status of applications for
24	our Federal Identification Number and the 501

1	status. David, do you have any
2	MR. NAREFSKY: Well, on the first
3	point, with some documents that had been focused
4	on earlier, we have received promptly and will
5	obtain a Tax I.D. number for the Trust I'm sure
6	in the next few days.
7	CHAIRMAN BELL: Good.
8	MR. NAREFSKY: And activity is starting
9	on the now with the Trust being a
10	not-for-profit having bylaws, now we can move
11	forward on 501(c)(3) status as well.
12	CHAIRMAN BELL: Okay. Questions?
13	ALDERMAN POPE: The timing for the
14	501(c)(3) again?
15	MR. NAREFSKY: Well, the application I
16	think we can get done quite soon. Then you're
17	into how long it takes the IRS to review these,
18	and I can't really vouch for that.
19	CHAIRMAN BELL: Any other questions for
20	David?
21	(No response.)
22	All right. That concludes the
23	organizational matters I think we wanted to talk
24	about today, so let's move into the presentation

- 1 by Steve Berlin.
- 2 Clearly this organization, this
- group is absolutely focused on everything we do
- 4 that we do with the highest of ethics so we
- 5 thought it would be appropriate to have Steve
- 6 Berlin come in and give us a briefing on the
- 7 ethical programs that we have here in the City
- 8 of Chicago. Steve?
- 9 MR. BERLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- I do have a brief power point which I can --
- 11 probably somebody who's more tech savvy than I,
- 12 and that would be Jacob. I will make copies of
- this available obviously to everybody.
- Just by way of introduction, I'm
- 15 Steve Berlin, the Executive Director of the
- 16 City's Board of Ethics. Some of you I know.
- 17 Many of you I know actually in various
- 18 capacities.
- The Board of Ethics, just by way of
- 20 introduction, is a small City agency with just
- 21 eight full-time staff members. We have a board
- that's appointed by the Mayor, confirmed by City
- 23 Council. Currently we have six board members.
- They serve without compensation. We administer

and enforce the City's Governmental Ethics
Ordinance.

has looked through its case law and has rendered an opinion that the Members of the Infrastructure Trust Board are, in fact, members of a City agency for purposes of Chapter 2-156 and therefore are subject to the Governmental Ethics Ordinance as City employed officials, therefore, all of you have filed your statements of financial interests and your ethics pledges which are required by Mayor Emanuel. Those are the post employment ethics pledges.

Now, I want to say that our board

The import of that statement is that as far as conflicts of interest go, as far as gifts go, the Members of the Infrastructure

Trust Board are subject to the Ethics Ordinance as City appointed officials, so except for Alderman Pope who is subject to it as an elected official of the City. He serves in two capacities.

What that means essentially just by
way of -- if I can just bounce back. We have
four basic functions at the Board of Ethics and

- then I'll get to substance here.
- 2 The first and most important is to
- 3 give advice and guidance. Advice and guidance
- 4 as some of you know is our bread and butter
- 5 work. We issue about 6,000 formal and informal
- 6 advisory opinions a year. They are all
- 7 confidential.

And that means that when people

9 contact us with questions about gifts, about

10 conflicts of interest, we render the opinion,

whether it's telephonic or it is e-mail or it is

a formal written opinion that's signed by either

me as the Executive Director or the Chairman,

Miguel Ruiz, it's rendered and it's

15 confidential.

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Share the fact that a person has come to us for an opinion or the nature of their question or the nature of their opinion unless we have the person's permission to do that. In other words, we need a waiver from the individual who requested the opinion from us before we will even confirm that an opinion has rendered, and

to the effect that a person allows us to discuss

the substance of the opinion, we will. That's a very critical point about what we do.

Unfortunately, it's a commonly misunderstood point about what we do, but it's right there in the law. And all of you should know that when you contact me for an advisory opinion, that advisory opinion is completely confidential.

Also we do education. All of the members of the Infrastructure Trust Board pursuant to the changes that were made to the Governmental Ethics Ordinance that will become effective on November 1st will be required to take an annual ethics training.

We've had all of the City employees take that training since calendar 2006, so now we will be covering the additional 2,100 or so appointed officials of the City. We will do a separate training program for them because they are subject to the ordinance in a slightly different way, and that will in all likelihood be on the Internet, although it's conceivable that we could come out and do a face-to-face training as well.

1	Third, we are a regulatory body
2	which means that we collect public disclosures.
3	Those of you who are members of the media know
4	what kind of disclosures we collect; the two
5	forms that I mentioned before, the ethics
6	pledges and the statements of financial
7	interests that are required of all City
8	appointed officials who serve on boards or
9	commissions that are not solely advisory, such
10	as this one, file those every year.
11	The last basic function that we have
12	is that to a limited degree we are an
13	enforcement agency, and our enforcement
14	authority is set forth in the Governmental
15	Ethics Ordinance.
16	We have the authority to investigate
17	and make recommendations and make determinations
18	and adjudications as to whether persons subject
19	to the Governmental Ethics Ordinance have
20	violated one or more of the provisions of that
21	ordinance, and all of our investigative work is
22	also by law confidential.
23	Now, one of the substantive topics
24	that I want to talk about first is gifts.

1	CHAIRMAN BELL: I have a question now.
2	MR. BERLIN: Yes, please.
3	CHAIRMAN BELL: The forms that we
4	filled out earlier, we all filled out the
5	financial interest statement and the pledge.
6	Your team, your office has reviewed those?
7	MR. BERLIN: Yes.
8	CHAIRMAN BELL: And you would let us
9	know if you had any issues?
10	MR. BERLIN: That's correct.
11	CHAIRMAN BELL: So we should assume as
12	of this date there are no issues?
13	MR. BERLIN: If you don't hear from us,
14	you can assume that there are no issues with the
15	form. It's complete. They are also made
16	available on the Internet.
17	CHAIRMAN BELL: Okay.
18	MR. BERLIN: So all the information on
19	that form is public information. In the old
20	days we used to ask for a home address. We
21	don't do that for people who file electronically
22	so you need not worry about that.
23	But all that information is public
24	information. It's kept on file or online with

1	the Board of Ethics for seven years, and then
2	after seven years those forms will be destroyed
3	pursuant to our records retention schedule with
4	the local Records Commissioner of Cook County.
5	CHAIRMAN BELL: To make sure, Steve, I
6	understood you correctly too that if we as we
7	work through our efforts here and we get to
8	different deals, if we perceive that there may
9	be one, we should come to your office and have
10	you evaluate that?
11	MR. BERLIN: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.
12	In fact, one of the comments that I wanted to
13	make is that I'm glad in some ways that you're
14	still working on your conflicts of interest
15	provisions because you are all subject to the
16	City's Governmental Ethics Ordinance.
17	The conflicts of interest provisions
18	and the financial interest provisions in the
19	City's Governmental Ethics Ordinance are
20	changing, and those changes will become
21	effective on November 1st.
22	So one of the things that my office
23	and I have been doing is reviewing those

changes, and some of them are subtle, some of

1 them are complex. And I think it would probably be in everybody's interests if we had some input and had the ability to make some comments on your bylaws so that they will conform completely 5 to the way the law is worded and the way we have and will interpret that law.

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But I think the very important point here is that if there's ever a situation where any of you or anybody who is subject to the ordinance believes that there's a potential conflict of interest, that's the time to pick up the phone.

If we don't have the answer, we will consult with either private counsel, your private counsel if we have your authority to do that, the Corporation Counsel or anybody else that you direct us to, either to find facts or to give an opinion so that the Members of the Infrastructure Trust Board are covered.

Our jurisdiction extends solely to Chapter 2-156 of the ordinance, not to the bylaws specifically, but that's why I think it behooves everybody to make sure that the bylaws themselves are in -- that there's no ambiguity

L	and that there's no difference in standards
2	between the law that's going to become effective
3	and the bylaws themselves.

Now, one of the things I do want to mention though is gifts. One of the things we did notice is that there's a potential conflict of interest if somebody receives gifts of a substantial nature. That raises the question of what is substantial.

The law as it's going to take effect on November 1st says that gifts to City officials or City employees, with some exceptions, are limited to \$50 so certainly one could posit that \$50 would be substantial.

There are also provisions that relate to representation of third parties. City appointed officials are prohibited from representing third parties before any City agency unless the matter of the representation is wholly unrelated to what they do on the board on which they serve.

So what that essentially means is that appointed officials of the City, such as members of the Trust Board, could not either act

1	as attorneys or consultants or lobbyists on
2	behalf of third parties in front of City
3	agencies unless the matters on which they were
4	representing those lobbying law consulting
5	clients was unrelated to this Board.
6	Then conflicts of interest.
7	Generally speaking, as I say, I'm glad to hear
8	that the bylaws are still a work in progress,
9	but to the extent that there might be
10	interpretations of the bylaws and possibly
11	differing interpretations of the Governmental
12	Ethics Ordinance, I think the general rule would
13	be follow which is stricter, but I think it will
14	be it's good timing that we have a chance to
15	review or that we have a chance to finalize the
16	bylaws at this point.
17	But just to announce that the City's
18	Governmental Ethics Ordinance does have very
19	detailed provisions on conflicts of interest,
20	when recusing is required and certain
21	transactions that might, in fact, be prohibited
22	depending on the facts, which is why we are
23	here, why our office exists.
24	One other provision that I do want

L t	to	point	out	is	the	prohibited	loans	provision
-----	----	-------	-----	----	-----	------------	-------	-----------

- What it says is that any City official or City
- 3 employee or their spouse or their domestic
- 4 partner cannot have or receive loans from
- 5 entities or persons doing business with the City
- 6 unless those loans are made by lending
- 7 institutions, financial lending institutions in
- 8 the ordinary course of business.

the City.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So, for example, I could put a

mortgage on my house with the Northern Trust

Company, but I could not, for example, or my

outside business, should I have one, could not

have a loan with ABC construction company which

is not normally in the business of making loans

if ABC construction company has contracts with

Then the last thing I just wanted to remind everybody here of is that the Members of the Infrastructure Trust Board, as have other appointees of Mayor Emanuel, have signed a revolving door pledge. The revolving door pledge imposes restrictions that have now been codified or will be codified as of November 1st as to the activities that you can do or can't do

1	after you would leave, for example, the
2	Infrastructure Trust Board or if I were, for
3	example, to retire from my position with the
4	Board of Ethics, certain things that I could and
5	couldn't do, certain persons or certain
6	transactions that I could and could not work on
7	for a certain period of time.
8	And the last thing I just want to
9	remind everybody here of is that the primary
10	function of the City's Board of Ethics is to
11	answer questions and render advisory opinions.
12	Not everybody has standing to ask for an
13	advisory opinion.
14	Our jurisdiction and our authority
15	to render advisory opinions is limited to City
16	officials, City employees, lobbyists,
17	contractors or their attorneys or former
18	employees. Everybody sitting at these tables
19	falls within our jurisdiction. Many of the
20	people sitting in this room fall within our
21	jurisdiction, but many people don't, and that's
22	a commonly misunderstood point.
23	But even if a person does not fall
24	within our jurisdiction, we will do our best to

1	answer their question within the bounds of our
2	law.
3	But everybody sitting at this table
4	or these two tables should know that they
5	have they fall within the jurisdiction, the
6	ambit, the purview of the Board of Ethics and
7	can ask us for an official advisory opinion.
8	And our authority to render opinions
9	is set forth in law, and our authority is
10	limited to Chapter 2-156 of the Municipal Code
11	which is the City's Governmental Ethics
12	Ordinance.
13	And our mantra in the office is that
14	there really is no such thing as a stupid
15	question, so I do want to stress that to
16	everybody here.
17	MR. HOFFMAN: In that spirit, can I
18	jump in, please?
19	CHAIRMAN BELL: Absolutely.
20	MR. HOFFMAN: Nice to see you.
21	MR. BERLIN: Nice to see you too.
22	MR. HOFFMAN: I think your point about
23	retiring is a moot point.
24	You started by a question about I

1	think you said right at the beginning about
2	our I think you said there was an opinion
3	that the Board or that you and counsel had
4	rendered that we were a City agency.
5	MR. BERLIN: For purposes of
6	Chapter 2-156, the Infrastructure Trust Board is
7	a City agency.
8	MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. And I assume that
9	that means that goes with the statement that
10	the Ethics Ordinance applies to us and our
11	activities and that the ethics the Board of
12	Ethics has jurisdiction over us.
13	MR. BERLIN: That's correct.
14	MR. HOFFMAN: Okay. Would you say that
15	that therefore means that the Inspector
16	General's Office has jurisdiction over us in the
17	same way?
18	MR. BERLIN: That's something that I
19	don't have the authority to answer because the
20	answer to that question, which might have been
21	address by the Corporation Counsel which I think
22	would be the appropriate body to ask that
23	question of, falls within the Inspector
24	General's enabling ordinance which is

- 1 Chapter 256.
- MR. HOFFMAN: So you're saying we might
- 3 be, in your view we could be a City agency for
- 4 the Board of Ethics but not for the Inspector
- 5 General's Office?
- 6 MR. BERLIN: I would say that -- all I
- 7 would say is that I would agree with the first
- 8 half of your question which I know that you are
- 9 a City agency for purposes of the Ethics
- 10 Ordinance.
- 11 As to whether you could or couldn't
- be for purposes of other provisions of the code,
- that I don't have the authority to answer.
- 14 MR. HOFFMAN: The only other question I
- 15 wanted to ask was if given that -- here's the
- 16 hypothetical that will never happen, but suppose
- 17 that someone believes that there has been a --
- they want to make an allegation of unethical
- 19 conduct regarding the Trust staff or Board, and
- they come to you with that, and the allegation
- 21 itself looks like it's something that would rise
- 22 to the level of misconduct and would be
- investigated by the IG's Office. Is that
- something that you would in the normal course

1 send over to the IG's office? 2 MR. BERLIN: We have that authority. 3 We have the authority to involve investigative 4 agencies in our investigations. We could 5 investigate it ourselves if we believe that it 6 would constitute a violation of the City's 7 Governmental Ethics Ordinance. We also have the discretion to involve investigating agencies or 8 to refer the matter completely to another 9 investigator agency. 10 11 MR. HOFFMAN: And I'll short circuit 12 I guess the point of the question is can we feel comfortable that if you get any sort of 13 allegations that you decide you're not going to 14 15 investigate that you will refer it over to the 16 IG's Office? 17 MR. BERLIN: As a general matter where 18 possible we would. I think it's hard to give a 19 general answer, but generally we would refer 20 complaints whenever possible to any investigative agency that we believe can act on 21 22 it. 23 Thank you for coming. MR. HOFFMAN:

MR. BERLIN: Good to see you.

24

1	CHAIRMAN BELL: Any other questions of
2	Steve? I just have one.
3	You mentioned several times about
4	reviewing our bylaws. Do you have a copy of
5	them?
б	MR. BERLIN: I have a copy that we took
7	off the Internet.
8	CHAIRMAN BELL: Okay. That's not the
9	updated version or has it been updated on the
10	Internet?
11	MR. YONOVER: I will get him a copy.
12	MR. BERLIN: I don't know that it is.
13	I think it was dated the 27th of July.
14	MR. HOFFMAN: And I would be interested
15	in your review of the draft conflict of interest
16	policy. One of the things that I noted that I
17	thought should be changed, and you'll see when
18	you read it, is that the first part of it has a
19	definition of financial interest that is
20	included in the policy, and then later it says
21	the definition of financial interest shall be
22	the one in the Governmental Ethics Ordinance.
23	MR. BERLIN: Yes. That's a good point
24	also because you may or may not know that the

1	definition of financial interest has changed
2	substantially in the Governmental Ethics
3	Ordinance, and that new definition will take
4	effect on November 1st.
5	CHAIRMAN BELL: So is it more
6	restrictive? I mean, is it
7	MR. BERLIN: It is more restrictive,
8	yes. It is definitely more restrictive.
9	CHAIRMAN BELL: Okay. Thank you. We
10	will wait to hear back from you on that.
11	MR. BERLIN: Thank you.
12	CHAIRMAN BELL: Okay. Thank you,
13	Steve.
14	Next we'll have an update on the
15	Retrofit Chicago Project. Lois?
16	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: Good
17	morning, everyone. I'm a little shorter than
18	Mr. Berlin.
19	This is going to be a very brief
20	update on Retrofit Chicago. We had a fairly
21	good discussion of it at the last board meeting,
22	and this is just part of a periodic report we'll
23	be making to you on projects that we hope to
24	bring before you in the near future.

1	Bottom line, the City and sister
2	agencies are working very diligently on
3	identifying the energy efficiency projects that
4	could achieve the goals that we outlined and the
5	proof points we outlined at our last meeting,
6	specifically to identify ways to do cross
7	governmental borrowing programs and financing
8	programs, to find ways of doing real risk
9	transfer, and to find more efficient capital
10	structures, and we're working very diligent on
11	on that.
12	The City has identified a citywide
13	steering group that is having biweekly meetings.
14	That includes, but is not limited to,
15	representatives of the Department of Finance,
16	Fleet and Facility Management, that is what was
17	once called General Services. That is the group
18	that manages all of our buildings and the fleet,
19	the cars and the trucks that we operate. The
20	Law Department of course, the Budget Office, our
21	Chief Sustainability Officer Karen Weigert and
22	the Public Building Commission.
23	The Public Building Commission
24	earlier in 2011 actually beginning in 2011

and continuing to 2012 went through a public RFP process to identify ESCO providers, and we are working with PBC to identify ways to partner with them on the use of those ESCOs.

An ESCO is an Energy Savings

Company, and they basically are -- have worked with governments around the country to generate those energy efficiency savings. They go in and do an audit of the prior utility bills, make a recommended plan that should happen, work on the implementation of that plan and then the commissioning of the project and monitoring of savings.

We hope that we can disaggregate some of those services when we present the Retrofit Chicago Program to you for consideration in a way that can get lower costs for our government and higher savings for our taxpayers.

In addition to the citywide group that we have meeting, we have departmental and agency meetings periodically. The key city departments that are proposing projects are Department of Water Management, FFM, that's the

1	Fleet and Facilities Group which has
2	responsibility for all the building, and the
3	Department of Aviation.
4	We also are meeting with the sister
5	agencies on a periodic basis. We've now had I
6	believe three meetings with all the sister
7	agencies where we ask their head of facilities
8	and their CFOs to get involved with coming
9	together and learning about what we're doing
10	with Retrofit Chicago, so there is no agency in
11	the City that can say they do not know what
12	Retrofit Chicago is, how to connect with it,
13	that they are all briefed on what we hope to
14	bring to the Trust so they are familiar with
15	what might happen so that we've created a very
16	solid line of communication with the sister
17	agencies. So we're doing it at both of those
18	levels.
19	ALDERMAN POPE: Excuse me, Lois.
20	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: Yes?
21	ALDERMAN POPE: Would the Department of
22	Transportation also be an agency or department
23	that would be included as part of this?
24	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: We have

1	briefed them. They are not the projects that
2	they have are slightly delayed and so the key
3	meeting that we're having on an almost
4	day-by-day basis it feels like, Karen, doesn't
5	it, CDOT isn't always part of those, but they do
6	have some projects we're developing with them
7	and that we expect to participate as well, yes.

ALDERMAN POPE: Thank you.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: The key activity we're asking of all those departments and all those agencies is really to focus on the information we need to do this for each of the individual underlying projects and we're talking about hundreds that could be considered.

We are looking for them to prepare and deliver to our working committee the project name and location, a summary of the project, what exactly are you trying to do, what is the payback period that you're expecting, what kind of savings do you expect from those improvements, what specific energy conservation measures are being planned for that building now and in the future and any specific notable features.

L	So each and every one of those
2	projects, whether it's a \$20,000 project or a
3	\$5 million project, we're getting them that
1	information.

We are also then requiring that we get a cash flow analysis for the entire life of the financing that might work for them so that we actually have the ability to project what the savings are and to verify what those savings might be.

We are also asking for a project management plan, specific design for energy conservation measures, an implementation plan and then a very significant plan on measuring and verifying savings.

We're also asking for each of the sister agencies or departments to think about the approval processes that's we're going to go through before we bring it in front of the Trust, which may include a letter by that department's commissioner that the project is approved or potentially inducement resolutions of the governing bodies to say yes, this is a project that we would like the Trust to consider

1 with us.

Last I want to go through just a few process steps as we're envisioning them and as we're kind of working through. These are going to be developed as a draft calendar for how we're working through this, but I don't want to go through all of that gory level of detail but give you a high level overview of the process steps we're working towards.

The first is to develop the project review process for Retrofit Chicago which is a cross agency review of each of those projects, then consider working with the Trust or have the Trust release RFQs for its financial partners and independent financial advisors, two very, very different roles.

The first being the type of firms that could actually invest in those projects, and the second, the independent financial advisors as required by the Executive Order of Mayor Emanuel that sets forth all of the criteria by which the Trust and its Board can evaluate the proposal coming forward.

The next step would be some type of

an informational update to City Council and to
the City agency boards as appropriate, and then
we're working on taking the data that we're
getting in each of the projects and populating a
data room so that to the extent we've identified
or you have identified financial partners, we'll
be able to share with those potential bidders
what data we have on the projects.

We would then hope to execute any necessary agreements with PBC and/or its ESCOs to verify some of those savings targets and the implementation plans, then develop a recommended plan of finance and seek for the consideration by the Trust.

Once we get all those points above, we want to be back in front of you to say this is what we have collectively put together and would like you to consider.

That would then enter into the formal review process by whatever independent financial advisor to assigned to such a project, and then we would go for final bids for the financing and bring it back for final approval of the Trust and again culminating in City

1	Council approval and/or the governing bodies.
2	That in a nutshell is some of the
3	process we're seeing and envisioning for
4	Retrofit Chicago, obviously subject to
5	discussion by the Trust and input from you all
6	on how you would like it to proceed.
7	CHAIRMAN BELL: Lois, a question.
8	Going back to the package that's being
9	assembled, I assume both for your purposes and
10	then also to be the information you draw from in
11	the package coming to us, is there a standard
12	for that?
13	Is there I mean, what are you
14	using as the guideline in terms of determining
15	what we'll need and how we will go about
16	evaluating or how you will go about evaluating?
17	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: We're
18	working with two groups. One are the ESCO
19	providers that PBC has qualified and they are in
20	the business of actually developing standardized
21	methodologies for reviewing those projects, and
22	the second is working with the engineering firms

that are working with Chicago Public Schools

that have also developed methodologies.

23

24

1	So we're bringing the best practices
2	from both of those together into a template and
3	organization of information that we're working
4	with Karen Weigert, our Chief Sustainability
5	Officer, on preparing for each project.
6	ALDERMAN POPE: Chairman?
7	CHAIRMAN BELL: Yes.
8	ALDERMAN POPE: Lois, do you foresee
9	many projects not going to the PBC? The PBC has
10	traditionally been the clearinghouse for City
11	and sister agency projects. Any examples of
12	those projects that might not go through the
13	PBC?
14	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: Yeah, I
15	think that there will be projects that won't go
16	through the PBC. I think that Chicago Public
17	Schools has several projects that are in process
18	today under the management of the Chicago Public
19	Schools Facilities Group and not going through
20	PBC, and they have significant energy savings
21	associated with them.
22	We think we might able to refinance
23	them through the Trust at a more efficient way
24	than what was otherwise available to them. So I

1	think there will be projects that don't require
2	the PBC.
3	ALDERMAN POPE: Thank you.
4	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: But in
5	all cases we're going to need to identify a
6	process to say here's what we spent on energy
7	before, here's what the improvements are and
8	here's how we document what savings have
9	occurred from implementation of those
10	improvements, and that savings becomes the Trust
11	estate, if you will, that funds all of the
12	financing for those improvements. So that's a
13	critical piece, whether it's done by PBC or
14	others.
15	MR. HOFFMAN: Mr. Chairman.
16	CHAIRMAN BELL: Yes.
17	MR. HOFFMAN: Lois, I've got some
18	questions about and I think this is maybe
19	for the Board as well about what our process
20	is to agree that this should be the first
21	project.
22	It's clear to me that the City and
23	you believe that this should be the first
24	project of the Trust.

1	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: That's
2	correct.
3	MR. HOFFMAN: It would be an excellent
4	project. It's in the public interest and so
5	on, you may be absolutely right. It could be
6	that You know, this will be our first run
7	going through this.
8	It could be we could set up the
9	Trust so that whatever the City comes to us with
10	we accept as the project, and then we're in
11	charge of sort of figuring out the details or we
12	could set ourselves up so that we independently
13	have to make a call about whether we agree that
14	this should be the first project.
15	I'm hoping the latter should be our
16	approach, but I don't think that's really been
17	decided. If it's up to us to decide, you know,
18	should this be the first project, then I think
19	it's important that at some point, and I don't
20	want to rush this, but maybe once we get an

think we should have some sort of a
meeting/hearing where we not only hear from Lois
and the City about why this would be a good idea

21

executive director on board, but at some point I

but	make	sure	that	there	's	an	oppoi	ctunity	for
othe	ers i	n the	publi	ic and	ot	thei	rwise	experts	s to
say	that	they	disag	gree.					

Frankly I'm not, you know -- when I hear you talk about all this and the planning that you're doing makes perfect sense because if we are going to approve this, you want the planning to be in place, so I understand that. But I think we have to hear from other voices about whether there are potential pitfalls with this as a project that we may not be able to assess ourselves.

And I don't suggest that that's today or it may not even be at the next meeting, but I think at some point before we decide, I want to be able to hear from those voices.

The second thing is that -- and I say that in part because to the extent I heard any commentary after the last meeting, it was about, you know, wait, have you guys decided on Retrofit Chicago. There was some confusion about whether that was decided or not.

I also heard that there were some portions of City government, including sister

agencies, that were already including expected
savings from an Infrastructure Trust approved
project under Retrofit Chicago in not only
budgets but in presentations to their bond
investors and so on, as if it was a fact.

You know, obviously it's not a fact.

It hasn't happened yet. I don't think that's prudent of any City agencies to do so because, you know, something might fall apart or we might disagree.

And the only note of caution on that I think in particular is that we know from past practices, and some people would say past mistakes, you don't want to see government get too locked -- you don't want to see a government get too locked into the savings before the deal, right, because then there's pressure to do the deal because you've already -- you need those savings.

So I think whatever -- to the extent that you agree with that, if you can communicate with both sister agencies and other parts of City government that, you know, it seems like a very good idea, it's going to need some flushing

Τ	out before the Trust so the Trust can make a
2	decision, but I wouldn't sort of put it in
3	write it in stone in terms of their budgets or
4	savings or in public presentations to bond
5	investors. That seems like a mistake.
6	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: Can I
7	respond, Mr. Chairman?
8	CHAIRMAN BELL: Sure. Absolutely.
9	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: I
10	couldn't agree more. One of the most important
11	and precious things about the Trust is your
12	independence so that your ability to make
13	have an independent view of some of these things
14	is really critically important and the driving
15	force behind the creation of the Trust is to be
16	the advocate for the public in an independent
17	and honest and open way. So that's critically
18	important and I share that.
19	I would also say that in the process
20	I outlined this would be we've been invited
21	here by the Chairman to give an update on the
22	project that we think might be coming to the
23	Trust, but it's very clear in the calendering
24	that there are several spots along the way where

the Trust will have to decide in your decision
whether you want to proceed with that or not,
and we have to be bound by that decision.

There's no -- you know, we can bring it back for reconsideration if the Chairman permitted us to put it on the agenda, but we do have several spots, and every meeting that we have is a public meeting, so there's public comment. People are free to come forward at each and every meeting of the Trust to provide that feedback that you're looking for. I think that's an important part of the agenda for each Trust meeting that there is public comment.

MR. HOFFMAN: I think that's important. You know, again, Mr. Chairman, subject to your views and the rest of the Board Members on this, it might be prudent at whatever is the right moment in time to identify this as an agenda, a specific agenda item of opinions about whether Retrofit Chicago should be the Trust's first project as an agenda item so that people know this is my opportunity to be heard on this in case I have a dissenting view.

You know, the presentations that you

1	made have been very persuasive and, you know, to
2	me there's, from what we've heard, a tremendous
3	amount of merit to this being the first project,
4	but I think it's important to have an open mind,
5	to see what other voices say and then make a
6	decision at the appropriate time.
7	I certainly haven't heard anything

that you've said that's inconsistent with that.

I know you agree with that, but I just wanted to sort of articulate that as we move forward and figure out what our process is.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: I think it's also incumbent on us as government officials to work on these behind the scenes and present things for consideration. I don't think we want to expect the Trust in its infancy to actually be the generator of every idea that we should be looking at.

I think we really are, in the early phases in particular, bringing ideas for consideration, let you make an independent view, not just the Trust but also as an independent financial advisor that opines on it as well.

MR. HOFFMAN: Thank you.

1	CHAIRMAN BELL: You know, on the
2	process, Lois, I just have a question on that.
3	Is this the process talking only about how you
4	would give it to us for consideration or is
5	there another process within the City and sister
6	agencies that actually decided who is on the
7	project itself and then are we talking about how
8	that project gets funded?
9	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: Yes,
10	that's exactly what is going on. So in the City
11	we're still working on getting advancing
12	these particular projects, and when we package
13	them and think that there's something there for
14	consideration by the Trust, we'll be coming
15	before the Trust and asking for consideration of
16	the Trust's financing programs to benefit those
17	projects just like schools would be doing and
18	other agencies.
19	CHAIRMAN BELL: So you would envision
20	every project that came to us would be already
21	vetted with that existing process in terms of
22	meaning the City or the City agencies that they
23	believe this is a priority?
24	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: Yes.

1	Right.
2	CHAIRMAN BELL: Okay.
3	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: As to
4	the issue that Mr. Hoffman raised about
5	including it in other budgets, what we've asked
6	of the CFOs of all the sister agencies is to
7	make their budgets permissive to include
8	projects that could be facilitated by the Trust,
9	and to the best of my knowledge in discussions
10	as recently as this week with the CFOs that is
11	what people are doing.
12	They're not saying that they're
13	counting on savings in any way, only that they
14	are making their capital plans permissive so the
15	project would be permitted to come to the Trust
16	for consideration.
17	CHAIRMAN BELL: Any other questions?
18	(No response.)
19	Thank you, Lois.
20	You know, our website now is up and
21	running. I've asked Lois to sort of walk us
22	through what it looks like and give you all some
23	idea as to how to access it. I recognize it's
24	in its infancy stages.

1	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: So the
2	website site that the City of Chicago Finance
3	Department under the ordinance is permitted to
4	offer staff support to the Trust through the
5	balance of this year, so one of the projects we
6	felt was very important from a transparency
7	perspective was to get a website up so the
8	public would have an information site.
9	So forgive me for not being a web
10	designer here, but I think we did a pretty gosh
11	darn good job to start. It will obviously take
12	on a life of its own as things go, but for an
13	organization that was born as recently as a
14	couple weeks ago, I think it's in pretty nice
15	shape.
16	So when you go to
17	ChicagoInfrastructure.org, there's a home page
18	which provides background and a mission
19	statement about the Infrastructure Trust.
20	There are just a couple things along
21	the top, the Board of Directors, so your
22	accountability to the public is up there. Each
23	of the Board of Directors, their website
24	excuse me, their bio and their picture is

presented so the public knows who you are and has a face associated with the Trust. It's not just this amorphous group of people but actual names and faces and background shared so the public knows who you are. When we have an advisory board, I would assume that you would want to include that on the website as well.

The next part is the meeting tab
which has schedule of meetings. You can see our
meeting today is on there and you can drop down
and see the agenda for the meeting along with
the location so that people can find the
meeting.

We will also then along the top have a transparency page which really has two elements to it. The first is the documents. So we have a court reporter taking copious minutes on everything we say and do here. Those would be placed on there about the meetings, and then the second part is an opportunity for public input to Director Hoffman's comments.

So people would be able to go online, register their name and their comments and that would be referred over to a

1	representative of the Trust to screen through
2	all those public comments and make sure they are
3	addressed.
4	So all of you are up online. So if
5	you consent we can make that a public document
б	as of today if you would like it.
7	CHAIRMAN BELL: Okay. Any comments?
8	ALDERMAN POPE: Thank you, Chairman.
9	Lois, I think James had asked a question, if
10	someone from the public had submitted a question
11	online regarding a proposal, John Doe says this
12	is something I think is relevant or an
13	opportunity for the Trust to consider, how do
14	you perceive that project making its way through
15	the process itself? Will it get referred to the
16	respective City agency for their consideration?
17	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: I think
18	that once you have your staff or advisors on
19	board I think you'll come up with a process of
20	how you want that done. Right now we're just
21	aggregating any comments we receive and sending
22	them to your Chair to redirect through his
23	office.
24	Not that we've received any yet

1	because it's not public, but that's our plan. I
2	sent myself a comment on there as we were
3	developing it.
4	MR. HOFFMAN: Lois, you have a young
5	man next to you who I believe was
6	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: Yes,
7	Jacob Ringer, my chief of staff from the
8	Department of Finance.
9	MR. HOFFMAN: And he was partially
10	responsible or perhaps fully responsible for
11	CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SCOTT: Yes, he
12	did this on his nights and weekends. He's not a
13	web programmer, he's a finance guy so I
14	appreciate his efforts very much.
15	MR. HOFFMAN: I do too and I wanted to
16	say nice job.
17	MR. RINGER: Thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN BELL: Okay. Moving onto
19	our financial reports, the first item under that
20	category is to approve the Grant Agreement.
21	The Grant Agreement is a pretty
22	comprehensive document. Essentially this
23	document, seeing as how we would work with the
24	City once we accept the initial \$200,000 grant,

1	and so we think that's appropriate to have that
2	kind of agreement, but at the same time because
3	of the complexity of this document, and quite
4	frankly the language seems to be rather
5	boilerplate and this activity is not
6	boilerplate, so we're probably going to defer.
7	I think I'm going to give this to the Board to
8	decide, but I think we're going to defer
9	approving that until we have an opportunity to
10	have our outside legal counsel take a look at
11	this and make sure that it really is written in
12	a way that's consistent with the activities of
13	this Trust.
14	And so with that I will put that
15	open to our Board to see if there are any other
16	comments, but my proposal would be that we defer
17	approving the grant until our next meeting and
18	until we allow our outside legal counsel to take
19	a look and advise us.
20	MR. HOFFMAN: I agree. I think that's
21	prudent. I also think depending on we'll see
22	how the timing goes, but if our legal counsel
23	has comments or revisions, we can get those in

advance so we have a chance to comment back and

1	forth, that would be great.
2	CHAIRMAN BELL: Absolutely.
3	MR. HOFFMAN: I think it's a good
4	idea.
5	CHAIRMAN BELL: Any other comments?
6	(No response.)
7	Okay. I think the same holds true
8	with the establishment of the bank account.
9	Obviously what we looked at, and Diana and I had
10	some talks and discussions around it, but now
11	that we've elected her treasurer we'll have her
12	work this, but obviously we're going to be
13	looking at how we can get a bank that sort of
14	meets some of the requirements, maybe minority
15	owned, maybe Chicago based, but someone that,
16	you know, we'll be looking at trying to make
17	sure we do business in the City itself.
18	That will be in general what the
19	framework of what Diana how Diana will be
20	working this, but we'll be able to get back and
21	decide that hopefully by the next meeting or
22	so.
23	MS. FERGUSON: Mr. Chairman, can I come
24	back to the Board with some recommendations at

1	the next meeting on that?
2	CHAIRMAN BELL: Absolutely.
3	Any other comments by the Board on
4	that?
5	(No response.)
6	Okay. Status of our staff and
7	consultant's report. Since our last meeting, we
8	have had some pretty encouraging discussions
9	with three firms that are actually willing to
10	provide pro bono support in three critical
11	areas that I think we need up front, and so the
12	Board we have some e-mails back and forth.
13	And, by the way, all those e-mails are public
14	record if you would like to see what we did.
15	The three firms are simply Chicago
16	based firms with strong reputations. First
17	Stewart Spencer in our preliminary discussion
18	has
19	MS. FERGUSON: Spencer Stewart.
20	CHAIRMAN BELL: Excuse me. Spencer
21	Stewart, thank you for correcting that. They
22	have in our preliminary discussions agreed to do
23	on a pro bono basis our search for an executive
24	director and so obviously this is something we

1	need to get kicked off, and I am going to
2	propose to the Board at the end of this
3	discussion that we vote to move forward and
4	develop a relationship with Spencer Stewart to
5	do just that.

The second is Public Financial

Management which is a financial advisor that has

considerable skills and capability and space for

working with and again we've had preliminary

discussions with them, and they also have agreed

to provide us temporarily interim financial

advice and support until we're able to get our

staffing and our executive director on board.

So again I'm going to ask our Board to act on

that.

And then finally we absolutely needed to get some legal support in place. We have had preliminary discussions with Kirkland Ellis, an outstanding legal firm in the Chicago area and obviously broader than Chicago but Chicago based, and they also have expressed an interest to provide us the legal support we need temporarily pro bono, and so I'm going to throw this open to the Board.

1	We've had some e-mail discussions,
2	but I want to be sure that we have an
3	opportunity clearly to restate any of the
4	positions I think we talked about in discussing
5	these three firms, so with that let me open it
6	up to the Board.
7	MR. HOFFMAN: You know, I'm as you
8	know, I'm comfortable with the decisions both
9	because, number one, you know, to me it's
10	critical that we get independent advice with our
11	mission, so to me if the advice that we're going
12	to get from these firms pass that test, then I
13	think it's a good thing.
14	And then second, the fact that it's
15	pro bono means that you know, and clearly
16	from some very high quality places means that it
17	should be very beneficial. It's obviously on an
18	interim basis, and if we get to the point that
19	we're I know you, Mr. Chairman, I believe
20	we're all in agreement that if we get to the
21	point where we're seeking to pay for
22	professional services then we'll go to some sort
23	of competitive process.
24	But I think it's a real I'm

1	comfortable and I think it's real positive to
2	be getting the pro bono services of these
3	firms.
4	MS. FERGUSON: I completely support the
5	notion of moving forward with these three firms.
6	They are very reputable, and in various
7	professional encounters I've had interaction
8	with each of the firms and have been very
9	pleased with their caliber of service. So I'm
10	supportive of moving forward.
11	ALDERMAN POPE: I too support it. The
12	fact that they are local and have significant
13	histories in these fields, I think it will be a
14	great match for us.
15	CHAIRMAN BELL: Motion?
16	ALDERMAN POPE: So moved.
17	CHAIRMAN BELL: All in favor.
18	(A chorus of ayes.)
19	Okay.
20	CHAIRMAN BELL: Having passed that, I
21	would like to ask the Board Members to accept
22	some assignments on how we then engage them
23	because I think, you know, David, I'd like you
24	to obviously interface with the legal firm, and

some of the things that I think we need to get to them right away is our bylaws, the Grant Agreement and, you know, start talking about what are the rules of engagement.

I guess the first thing we need to do is figure out how do we document what our arrangement is and we probably should have some discussion about that. Let's start thinking along those lines.

And then, Diana, if you can work with Public Financial Management, I think start to lay in line what we're going to need at least initially.

And then I would propose to work with Spencer Stewart on the executive director and then, of course, you guys jump in anywhere you want. I'm just thinking about how we can start to move this and get this foundation in place so that we have the level of comfort of our independence and that we're starting to get some of the things that have to fundamentally get done first before some package shows up on our doorstep to look at that we have some legs and arms in place to help us to deal with that.

1	If that's okay with all of you, then
2	I propose we move on in that direction.
3	MR. HOFFMAN: That's fine. On the
4	executive director search, do you know if it's
5	posted?
6	CHAIRMAN BELL: We haven't done
7	anything yet I don't think. So we're going to
8	get with the search firm and we're going to
9	obviously clearly the tenants are it needs to
10	be public, it needs to be maybe even figure
11	out how to make sure that the search is done in
12	a way that all that are qualified are able to
13	participate and get their name into the hat, so
14	that's what I'll be working on.
15	I would think the first thing they
16	are going to do is tell us we probably need to
17	make the description a little more specific. So
18	we'll have to work our way through it, and I'll
19	get back with you and work with you all to make
20	sure that what we do is consistent with what our
21	intentions are.
22	But I'm expecting them to help us
23	with meeting what we all feel strongly about is

an obligation to make sure that there's a public

Τ	posting and that all will have a fair chance.
2	Any other questions, thoughts?
3	(No response.)
4	Okay. Other business? Any other
5	business Excuse me, I guess we got to get to
6	the Board dates. I circulated a number of dates
7	for the rest of the year, September 20th,
8	October 18th and November 5th, and we left
9	December to be determined because we were
10	struggling between the 14th and the 17th.
11	By the way, I got input back from
12	all of you that some of these dates are good and
13	some of these dates are not. Now, things will
14	change and obviously we'll have an opportunity
15	for Members to participate by telephone, and
16	that was not passed in our bylaws.
17	In lieu of anything better, I mean,
18	I think I would say that I would propose that
19	we approve these dates for the time being, and
20	if things change then we'll go through the
21	process of revising them, if necessary.
22	MR. HOFFMAN: I know as I said in
23	the e-mail I know I cannot make the 20th of
24	September. I'm in an all day court related

1	thing that I can't get out of. I am free the
2	next day, but if the meeting ends up staying on
3	the 20th, I know I'm unavailable. What was the
4	first October date?
5	MR. RAMIREZ: 18th.
6	MR. HOFFMAN: And as I said, on that
7	day I am in an all day thing in D.C. So those
8	two days unfortunately
9	CHAIRMAN BELL: Those two meetings you
10	can't attend. You could not make even by
11	telephone?
12	MR. HOFFMAN: No. I know for sure
13	September 20th I'm just I'm all day in court
14	And the 18th is unlikely. If I can, I would be
15	happy to do it just by phone.
16	CHAIRMAN BELL: So what about
17	November 5th?
18	MR. HOFFMAN: That's fine for me. I
19	certainly don't want to stand in the way of
20	pushing anything back that far. Those two
21	particular days
22	CHAIRMAN BELL: I think we probably
23	need to circulate some more dates and see if we
24	can do this between meetings via email to get

1	these dates and get them posted. We have an
2	obligation to post it because of the Public
3	Meetings Act that we show what the dates for the
4	next meetings for the year are so we need to be
5	mindful of that.
6	I just don't know what better dates
7	you're going to come up with honestly. I don't
8	need you out of the first the next two
9	meetings. That's not going to work.
10	MR. HOFFMAN: Well, I apologize.
11	CHAIRMAN BELL: No. No. I understand.
12	Jorge had issues with timing. He can do the
13	dates but he had issues with the timing. Why
14	don't I work with Lois' office and let's get
15	some common dates and try another series and see
16	if we can get them approved?
17	MR. HOFFMAN: Okay.
18	CHAIRMAN BELL: Otherwise we're just
19	putting dates that we know we won't make.
20	Any other thoughts? Other business?
21	(No response.)
22	Not having any then let's move to
23	the public comments. Were there any?
24	Why don't you state your name and

1	maybe your affiliation for our minutes?
2	MS. MILLER: I'm Emily Miller. I run
3	policy for the Better Government Association.
4	First I have just wanted to say
5	CHAIRMAN BELL: What was the name?
6	MS. MILLER: The Better Government
7	Association.
8	CHAIRMAN BELL: Thank you.
9	MS. MILLER: I've had a lot of coffee
10	so I apologize.
11	I want to say that I am encouraged
12	by the level of conversation that there is about
13	ethics and the presentation from Steve's office.
14	Obviously that's a good thing to see that
15	everybody is thinking about those things and
16	that you're taking such a long time to think
17	about the conflicts of interest, the
18	requirements that you're going to end up
19	implementing, but I do have two legal concerns
20	with the way that you are now defined under the
21	Ethics Ordinance according to Steve's office.
22	So there are two specific concerns
23	that I have. First if the Ethics Commission
24	ends up referring a case over to the Inspector

General's Office, if the Inspector General does
not have full jurisdiction as laid out in the
actual City ordinance, there could be some
issues with whether or not they're able to
actually pursue the thing that is referred to
them.

To be honest, I haven't seen what you just approved in the bylaws in terms of where the Inspector General fits in with the bylaws, but if the Trust is a City agency for purposes of the Ethics Commission, it seems to me that it might be likely that they are also a City agency when it comes to the Inspector General and so then the ordinance would trump whatever it is that is in the bylaws.

And then that concern extends also to the Freedom of Information Act. So the bylaws that I saw before anyway laid out a very specific plan for Freedom of Information Act requests, and when FOIA requests are denied, those denials go to the City who then determines whether or not those denials were legitimate.

Well, if the Trust is operating as a City agency, then that process actually is not

1	the same as what the State law requires for the
2	Freedom of Information Act.
3	So under State law a person who has
4	their FOIA request denied would actually have
5	the ability to go to the Attorney General's
6	Office through the Public Access Counselor to
7	have that denial reviewed instead of it getting
8	funneled through the City.
9	So my concern is just in terms of a
10	definition of what the Trust is, if it's going
11	to be a City agency in some areas but not in
12	other areas, I'm not quite sure how that's going
13	to work out.
14	So any guidance in terms of legal
15	definitions I think would certainly be
16	appreciated from my organization's standpoint
17	but then I think probably just the public in
18	general.
19	CHAIRMAN BELL: Well, I think you ought
20	to read the clause that we've added and see if
21	that satisfies any of your concerns, and then we
22	can go from there, work from there, but I think
23	we'll clearly take a look at this.

I mean, our intention is to

1	cooperate fully with both the inspector General
2	and the Freedom of Information Act. That's the
3	intention.
4	MS. MILLER: Right. It's the appeals
5	process that is specifically laid out in State
6	law that's different under the bylaws than under
7	State law for the FOIA process.
8	MR. HOFFMAN: First of all, you know,
9	Emily, it's always good to see you.
10	MS. MILLER: Yes, you too.
11	MR. HOFFMAN: We hope the BGA continues
12	to, as I know you will, come in and comment.
13	It's very valuable so we appreciate it.
14	No question, the issues you're
15	hitting on were debated at great length in City
16	Council. The position that you're arguing for,
17	you know, did not triumph, and so to a certain
18	extent some of those decisions were made when
19	the ordinance said that we were not a public
20	body in relation to FOIA and Open Meetings Act
21	and was silent on whether the IG had full
22	jurisdiction.
23	But then a subsequent executive
24	order said that the Trust should act as if FOIA

1	and the Open Meetings Act applied. You're
2	pointing exactly to one thing that has concerned
3	some people which is that well, there's still a
4	difference and that relates to the appeals
5	process. So you're right to put your finger on
6	that.
7	And that's one of the reasons that I
8	asked Steve that question because I think that
9	it probably maybe raises an eyebrow that one
10	City agency, the Board of Ethics, has said that
11	we are, in fact, a City agency, which, if it was
12	true across the Board, would have given
13	different answers necessarily at the time of the
14	ordinance being passed.
15	So it would be strange if we were a
16	City agency for one purpose, the Board of
17	Ethic's purposes, but not for other purposes
18	like FOIA and the Open Meetings Act.
19	I forgot to say, Steve, is that
20	opinion something that we can see? That would
21	be great if we could get a copy of that.
22	MR. BERLIN: Yes.
23	MR. HOFFMAN: Two things. I think

you're right to target those issues but two

2	Number one, with regard to the IG,
3	this Board and now with the statement in the
4	bylaws, we have been clear in our oral
5	statements and we now are clear on the record
6	that we are not going to do anything to stand in
7	the way of the IG investigating whatever they
8	want with regard to the Trust.

The bylaws make it clear that we will be open to the IG, cooperative with the IG with regard to all our operations and programs and activities. So the ordinance is silent on that.

To the extent there is some jurisdictional difference with the Board of Ethics, that's a legal issue. That's up to the City to address. That's not something we have the power to address.

What we have the power to do is say in our bylaws here's how we're going to be act and it's clear that we're just going to be open.

With regard to the issues of FOIA,

Open Meetings Act, et cetera, those are not

things -- and the appeal process once it leaves

L	our hands, those are things that unfortunately
2	need to be directed toward the City because
3	those are I think good legal questions but legal
1	questions that, you know, the governmental
5	authority, the City would need to answer.
5	I do think that the Ethics Board's

or staff's opinion probably creates, you know, an open question in that regard since you have an agency -- one agency declaring us to be a City agency.

ongoing discussion because of the Board of
Ethics' decision, but I want you to know that
from our perspective we are doing everything
that we can in our power to say, you know, we're
open, we're transparent, we're open to the IG
and we want to do everything we can that's
within our legal authority, but to a certain
extent our legal authority is set by the
ordinance and Trust.

You know, other than the appeal,
we'll, you know -- the bylaws make it clear that
we will be acting just as if FOIA and the Open
Meetings Act apply. We are going to be open to

1	the IG.
2	We want this to be a continuing
3	discussion, so if folks see other things that
4	we should do, it's great. That's why I
5	appreciate the thought being brought forward,
6	but those are my reactions knowing these issues
7	quite well.
8	MS. MILLER: Thank you.
9	ALDERMAN POPE: Thank you very much.
10	CHAIRMAN BELL: Any other public
11	comment?
12	(No response.)
13	Seeing none, the meeting is
14	adjourned. Thank you very much.
15	(Which were all the proceedings
16	had in the above-entitled
17	cause.)
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS:
2	COUNTY OF COOK)
3	
4	I, MARI BETH KAWULIA, a Certified
5	Shorthand Reporter of the State of Illinois, do
6	hereby certify that I reported in shorthand the
7	proceedings had at the meeting aforesaid, and
8	that the foregoing is a true, complete and
9	correct transcript of the proceedings of said
10	meeting as appears from my stenographic notes so
11	taken and transcribed under my personal
12	direction.
13	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I do hereunto set my
14	hand at Chicago, Illinois, this 13th day of
15	September, 2012.
16	
17	
18	
	MARI BETH KAWULIA
19	C.S.R. No. 084-2873
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	